

REMARKS

Applicants will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1-3, 9-14, 23

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-3, 9-14 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US 2002/0070385), in view of Koyama (US 2001/0002703) in view of Himeshima et al. (JP 09-235546) and Yamazaki et al. (US 2002/0074936). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claims 1, 2 and 23 to include two additional features.

The first additional feature relates to the interface between the anode and the first passivation film, and in particular, that the interface of the anode and the first passivation film is parallel to the surface of the substrate. As the Examiner admits, Koyama teaches that the anode is in contact with the first passivation film. However, the interface between the anode (item 556) and the first passivation film (item 554) is not parallel to the surface of the substrate, as shown in Figures 11 and 16 in Koyama. In contrast, in the present application, the interface between the anode (e.g. 121) and the passivation film (e.g. 125) is parallel to the substrate surface. See e.g. Figure 3. Therefore, even if the references are combined (which Applicants do not admit is proper), the combination still fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature of the present invention.

The other claimed feature is that the TFT is electrically connected to the anode and the TFT is configured to be operated in the saturated region. These features do not appear to be disclosed or suggested by the cited references. For example, there is no disclosure, suggestion, reason or motivation disclosed in Himeshima to use the dopant at the concentration of 0.1% by weight or more and 0.4% by weight or less in the EL device having TFT which is operated in the saturated region. Further, Yamagata, Koyama, and Yamazaki also provide no disclosure, suggestion, reason or motivation to operate the driving TFT in the saturated region at the dopant concentration disclosed by the present invention. Therefore, the cited references do not disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Therefore, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the device of independent Claims 1, 2 and 23, and Claims 1, 2 and 23 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4

The Examiner also rejects Claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama, Himeshima et al. and Yamazaki '936 and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 6,359,320). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 5

The Examiner also rejects Claim 5 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama, Himeshima et al. and Yamazaki '936 and further in view of Tamai et al. (US 5,793,497). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6

The Examiner also rejects Claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama, Himeshima et al. and Yamazaki '936 and further in view of *Producing Monolithic Light Emitting Diode Display Chips* (IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 16, Issue 1, Pg. 6, 6/1/1973). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 7

The Examiner also rejects Claim 7 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama, Himeshima et al. and Yamazaki '936 and further in view of Jones et al. (US 6,069,443). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 15

The Examiner also rejects Claim 15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama, Himeshima et al. and Yamazaki '936 and further in view of Tamano et al. (US 5,968,675). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Applicant is also adding new Claims 24-35.

It is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment or the new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 26, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/
Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568